Roadmap to rebound: how to address rebound effects from resource efficiency policy

David Font Vivanco[1*], Serenella Sala[2], and Will McDowall[1]

[1] UCL Institute for Sustainable Resources, University College London (UCL), WC1H 0NN London, United Kingdom

[2] European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Directorate D: Sustainable Resources, Bioeconomy Unit, Ispra, Italy

* Corresponding author: David Font Vivanco; e-mail: d.vivanco@ucl.ac.uk; Tel.: +44(0)20 3108 5935

Supporting information

Table S1. Classification of the reviewed studies according to desired characteristics in terms of scope, rebound mechanisms, product properties, and indicators, for assessing rebound effects from policy. A cross symbol means that the study considers a particular characteristic in its analysis.

Study	Focus	Area(s) of policy intervention	Rebound effect size	Key drivers	Scope		Rebound mechanisms			Product properties		Indicators	
					Endogenous technical changes	Regional, national or international level	Direct effect	Indirect effects	Macro-economic effects	Changes in product attributes	Capital costs	Life cycle-based	Multiple indicators
(Wood et al., 2017)	Consumer-oriented diet and clothing policy interventions in Europe.	Food and clothing	25 to 75%	Direct economic savings and differences in carbon intensity	X (Expert opinion)	International		x				x	
(Freire-González, 2011)	Energy performance of household energy efficiency policies in Catalonia	Energy	35 to 49%	Direct economic savings	X (Empirical evidence)	Regional	x						
(D'Haultfœuille et al., 2014)	Feebate scheme to promote the purchase of less polluting cars in France	Transport	35 to 170%	Additional travel demand, increased fleet, and manufacturing scale	X (Empirical evidence)	National	x						
(Hennessy and Tol, 2011)	Tax reform on new car purchases in Ireland	Transport	37 to 61%	Direct economic savings	X (Empirical evidence)	National	x						
(Davis, 2008)	Water and energy consumption of a government-sponsored	Water and energy	NA	Direct economic savings and larger capacity	X (Empirical evidence)	Regional	x			x			

Study	Focus	Area(s) of policy intervention	Rebound effect size	Key drivers	Scope		Rebound mechanisms			Product properties		Indicators	
					Endogenous technical changes	Regional, national or international level	Direct effect	Indirect effects	Macro-economic effects	Changes in product attributes	Capital costs	Life cycle-based	Multiple indicators
	high-efficiency cloth washer giveaway in Bern, Kansas												
(Davis et al., 2014)	Large-scale appliance replacement program in Mexico	Energy	72%	Notable economic savings and energy-intensive features of the new appliances	X (Empirical evidence)	National	x			x			
(Mizobuchi, 2008)	Carbon performance of Japanese energy saving policies	Energy	27 to 115%	Capital costs incurred by households	X (Empirical evidence)	National	x	x			x	x	
(Font Vivanco et al., 2015)	EU-level eco-innovation policies	Transport	-1,500 to 7,189%	Direct economic savings and differences in impact intensity	X (Empirical evidence)	International	x	x		x	x	x	x
(Dandres et al., 2012)	EU-level bioenergy policy scenarios	Energy	-69 to 45%	Drop in coal and lignite production costs and increase in exports	X (Expert opinion)	International			x			x	x
(Barker et al., 2007a)	Energy efficiency policies and	Energy	11 to 25%.	Reductions in industrial costs and prices in	X (Empirical evidence)	National	x	x	x		x	x	

Study	Focus	Area(s) of policy intervention	Rebound effect size	Key drivers	Scope		Rebound mechanisms			Product properties		Indicators	
					Endogenous technical changes	Regional, national or international level	Direct effect	Indirect effects	Macro-economic effects	Changes in product attributes	Capital costs	Life cycle-based	Multiple indicators
	programmes in the UK			energy-intensive industrial sectors and extra energy output being consumed by energy-intensive industries.									
(Barker et al., 2007b)	Voluntary climate change agreements from energy-intensive industrial sectors in the UK	Energy	16 to 26%	Reduction in energy costs for producers	X (Empirical evidence)	National	x	x	x		x	x	

References

Barker, T., Ekins, P., and Foxon, T. (2007a). Macroeconomic effects of efficiency policies for energy-intensive industries: The case of the UK Climate Change Agreements, 2000–2010. *Energy Econ.* 29, 760–778. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2006.12.008.

Barker, T., Ekins, P., and Foxon, T. (2007b). The macro-economic rebound effect and the UK economy. *Energy Policy* 35, 4935–4946. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2007.04.009.

D'Haultfœuille, X., Givord, P., and Boutin, X. (2014). The Environmental Effect of Green Taxation: The Case of the French Bonus/Malus. *Econ. J.* 124, F444–F480. doi:10.1111/ecoj.12089.

Dandres, T., Gaudreault, C., Tirado-Seco, P., and Samson, R. (2012). Macroanalysis of the economic and environmental impacts of a 2005-2025 European Union bioenergy policy using the GTAP model and life cycle assessment. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 16, 1180–1192. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2011.11.003.

Davis, L. W. (2008). Durable goods and residential demand for energy and water: evidence from a field trial. *RAND J. Econ.* 39, 530–546. doi:10.1111/j.0741-6261.2008.00026.x.

Davis, L. W., Fuchs, A., and Gertler, P. (2014). Cash for Coolers: Evaluating a Large-Scale Appliance Replacement Program in Mexico. *Am. Econ. J. Econ. Policy* 6, 207–238. doi:10.2307/43189409.

Font Vivanco, D., Kemp, R., and Van Der Voet, E. (2015). The relativity of eco-innovation: environmental rebound effects from past transport innovations in Europe. *J. Clean. Prod.* 101. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.019.

Freire-González, J. (2011). Methods to empirically estimate direct and indirect rebound effect of energy-saving technological changes in households. *Ecol. Model. We Break Addict. to Foss. Energy? Spec. Issue, 7th Bienn. Int. Work. Adv. Energy Stud. Barcelona, Spain, 19-21 Oct. 2010* 223, 32–40. Available at: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304380011004595.

Hennessy, H., and Tol, R. S. J. (2011). The impact of tax reform on new car purchases in Ireland. *Energy Policy* 39, 7059–7067. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2011.08.011.

Mizobuchi, K. (2008). An empirical study on the rebound effect considering capital costs. *Energy Econ.* 30, 2486–2516. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2008.01.001.

Wood, R., Moran, D., Stadler, K., Ivanova, D., Steen-Olsen, K., Tisserant, A., et al. (2017). Prioritizing Consumption-Based Carbon Policy Based on the Evaluation of Mitigation Potential Using Input-Output Methods. *J. Ind. Ecol.* doi:10.1111/jiec.12702.